

## REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 13 and 27 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Trembley. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite "an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener." Claim 27 has similarly been amended to recite "a sealing ring having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be disposed entirely within the well of the internal shoulder and receiving the pin." Support for the amendments can be found in the description at page 3, lines 10-12, and Figs. 3 and 6A. As is illustrated in Figs. 2 and 4 of Briles, the external diameter of the sealing insert 16 of Briles is greater than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the counterbore 26 of the base portion of the nut 12 that receives the sealing insert. Similarly, the seal 16 of Trembley has an external diameter well beyond the space provided by the counterbore 30 in the base 18. In Briles, compression of the sealing insert presses the sealing insert material outside of the space provided by the counterbore 26, and in Trembley, compression of the seal presses the sealing insert material outside of the space provided by the counterbore and outside of the

base 18. It is respectfully submitted that Briles and Trembley do not teach, disclose or suggest an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 are novel and inventive over Briles and Trembley, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles in view of Trembley should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-23, 27, 28 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Trembley in view of Briles. As noted above, Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite "an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener." Claim 27 has similarly been amended to recite "a sealing ring having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be disposed entirely within the well of the internal shoulder and receiving the pin." As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Trembley and Briles do not teach, disclose or suggest an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of

the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed.

Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or modified Trembley in view of Armour, cited to disclose the process in which a collar having an internal diameter larger than a pin is positioned on the pin, then plastically deformed inwardly to engage the shaft of the pin by a swaging tool. Claim 27 recites "a sealing ring having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be disposed entirely within the well of the internal shoulder and receiving the pin." As is illustrated in Fig. 2 of Armour, the external diameter of the plastic element 31 of Armour is also greater than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the internal bore 21 of the collar 20. It is respectfully submitted that Briles, Trembley and Armour do not teach, disclose or suggest an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley and Armour, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 27, 28, 31, 33 and 34 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Armour should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles or modified Trembley in view of Rath, which was cited as disclosing a collar made of aluminum or titanium. The Examiner again mentioned, but did not apply, Armour. Claims 5 and 6 depend from Claim 1, Claims 18 and 19 depend from Claim 13, and Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 27. It is respectfully submitted that modified Briles, modified Trembley, and Rath, as well as Armour, do not teach, disclose or suggest an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. The burden is on the Examiner to clearly explain the grounds of a rejection for obviousness, and it is further respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to clearly explain whether Armour is applied or not in connection with the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley, and Rath, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 18, 19, 29 and 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Rath should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from modified Briles or modified Trembley, further in view of Breed, which was cited as disclosing a rounded groove and flange. Claims 11 and 12 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 13. As is illustrated in Figs. 2 and 5

of Breed, the external diameter of the seal element at 55 and 95 is clearly greater than the diameter of the recess 22 and 85 of the nut 10 and 60. It is respectfully submitted that Briles, Trembley and Breed do not teach, disclose or suggest an internal sealing insert having an external diameter no larger than the diameter of the internal shoulder of the base portion of the swage collar, so as to be tightly sealed entirely in the well of the swage collar between the internal shoulder of the swage collar and the shaft of the fastener in engagement with the fastener, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 are novel and inventive over Briles, Trembley and Breed, either taken separately or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 on the grounds of obviousness from Briles or Trembley in view of Breed should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul  
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw

Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201  
145795.1